

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JUNGLE DEMOCRACY, :
: :
Plaintiff, :
: :
vs. : CIVIL ACTION 06-00207-WS-B
: :
THE STATE OF NEW YORK, :
: :
Defendant. :
:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Doc. 1), together with a Motion to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees (Doc. 2). This action was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72.2(c)(1) for appropriate action. Due to Plaintiff's failure to prosecute and to comply with the Court's Order dated August 24, 2007 (Doc. 3), it is recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

Upon review of Plaintiff's complaint and motion to proceed without prepayment of fees, the Court found that both documents were wholly illegible and incomprehensible. (Doc. 1). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to proceed without prepayment of fees was denied as deficient; however, Plaintiff was granted leave to refile its motion by September 13, 2007. Additionally, the Court advised Plaintiff of deficiencies in its complaint and of the pleading requirements contained in Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure. Plaintiff was ordered to file an amended complaint that cured the noted deficiencies and complied with Rule 8(a) by September 11, 2007. Plaintiff was expressly cautioned that the failure to file an amended complaint, together with a new motion to proceed without prepayment of fees, or in lieu thereof, to pay the \$350.00 filing fee, would result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute and to obey the Court's Order. (Doc. 3). To date, Plaintiff has not responded in any manner to the Court's Order, nor has Plaintiff's copy of the Court's Order been returned to the Court.

Due to Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's Order (Doc. 3) and to prosecute this action, and upon consideration of the alternatives that are available to the Court, it is recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as no other lesser sanction will suffice. Link v. Wabash R. R., 370 U.S. 626, 630, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 8 L. Ed.2d 734 (1962) (interpreting Rule 41(b) not to restrict the court's inherent authority to dismiss sua sponte an action for lack of prosecution); World Thrust Films, Inc. v. International Family Entertainment, Inc., 41 F.3d 1454, 1456-57 (11th Cir. 1995); Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-op, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989); Goforth v. Owens, 766 F.2d 1533, 1535 (11th Cir. 1985); Jones v. Graham, 709 F.2d 1457, 1458 (11th Cir. 1983). Accord Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 111 S. Ct. 2123, 115

L. Ed.2d 27 (1991) (ruling that federal courts' inherent power to manage their own proceedings authorized the imposition of attorney's fees and related expenses as a sanction); Malautea v. Suzuki Motor Co., 987 F.2d 1536, 1545-46 (11th Cir.) (finding that the court's inherent power to manage actions before it permitted the imposition of fines), cert. denied, 510 U.S. 863, 114 S. Ct. 181, 126 L. Ed.2d 140 (1993).

The attached sheet contains important information regarding objections to the Report and Recommendation.

DONE this **26th** day of **March 2008**.

/s/ SONJA F. BIVINS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURAL RIGHTS
AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION
AND FINDINGS CONCERNING NEED FOR TRANSCRIPT**

1. **Objection.** Any party who objects to this recommendation or anything in it must, within ten days of the date of service of this document, file specific written objections with the clerk of court. Failure to do so will bar a *de novo* determination by the district judge of anything in the recommendation and will bar an attack, on appeal, of the factual findings of the magistrate judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)©; Lewis v. Smith, 855 F.2d 736, 738 (11th Cir. 1988). The procedure for challenging the findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge is set out in more detail in SD ALA LR 72.4 (June 1, 1997), which provides, in part, that:

A party may object to a recommendation entered by a magistrate judge in a dispositive matter, that is, a matter excepted by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), by filing a "Statement of Objection to Magistrate Judge's Recommendation" within ten days after being served with a copy of the recommendation, unless a different time is established by order. The statement of objection shall specify those portions of the recommendation to which objection is made and the basis for the objection. The objecting party shall submit to the district judge, at the time of filing the objection, a brief setting forth the party's arguments that the magistrate judge's recommendation should be reviewed *de novo* and a different disposition made. It is insufficient to submit only a copy of the original brief submitted to the magistrate judge, although a copy of the original brief may be submitted or referred to and incorporated into the brief in support of the objection. Failure to submit a brief in support of the objection may be deemed an abandonment of the objection.

A magistrate judge's recommendation cannot be appealed to a Court of Appeals; only the district judge's order or judgment can be appealed.

2. **Opposing party's response to the objection.** Any opposing party may submit a brief opposing the objection within ten (10) days of being served with a copy of the statement of objection. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72; SD ALA LR 72.4(b).

3. **Transcript (applicable where proceedings tape recorded).** Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the magistrate judge finds that the tapes and original records in this action are adequate for purposes of review. Any party planning to object to this recommendation, but unable to pay the fee for a

transcript, is advised that a judicial determination that transcription is necessary is required before the United States will pay the cost of the transcript.

/s/ SONJA F. BIVINS

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE